Lead Entity Advisory Group
November 17, 2004
Ellensburg, WA
Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, Vice Chair Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE Bill Towey, Okanogan County/Colville Tribes LE Kim Bredensteiner, Island County LE John Sims, Quinault Nation LE Amy Hatch-Winecka, Thurston, Mason LE
Others Present:	Richard Visser, WDFW Joel Frudenthal, Yakima County Roy Huberd, Pierce County LE Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB Brian Walsh, WDFW Kristi Lynett, WDFW Susan Zemek, IAC/SRFB Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council
LEAG Members Absent:	Doug Osterman, Green-Duwamish LE, Chair (excused) Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Approval of Meeting Notes/ Agenda	The agenda was approved with three additions 1. LEAG needs to develop a response to the Nichols paper 2. Monitoring; especially the Status and Trends Proposal 3. The LEAG policies and procedures work group needs to get going.
Introduction/ Chair Report	Doug Osterman could not make the meeting, so Vice-Chair Steve Martin convened the meeting. Doug attended the last SRFB meeting and worked with Brian Walsh and Steve to design the LEAG meeting, and in particular to solicit comments from LEAG on several questions posed by the SRFB. Doug contacted his LE buddies before the meeting and wrote up their collective thoughts to be shared at the meeting.
WDFW Report	Kristi Lynett reported that the LE/RFEG brochure has been printed, and that copies will be sent to all LEs and RFEGs.
Update on 5th Round	Jim Fox reviewed several documents, including the "Distribution of SRFB Funds Across LE Lists", and "Part V of the Fifth Round Staff Report" [available on SRFB website]. Jim shared the evolution of the 1st increment of funding and explained how the revised stream mile information lead to an adjustment. Because of inaccurate information last year, the 1st increment "pot" has been increased by approximately $200,000. About half of the LEs will receive the same amount of funding as published last year, and the other half will receive up to $30,000 more.

	The full 5th Round Staff Report is available online, but Jim shared several statistics; 188 projects from 26 lists asking for \$49 million. POC = 55 then 27 then down to 19 after fix it loop. Strategy review ratings were changed for 10 LE's. Steve Leider took RP ratings and graphed them by converting ratings to numerical scores. No matter which scenario graphed, there was clearly three groupings that saw the same LE fall into no matter which scenario was run. There is a paradigm shift offering = earlier grant rounds saw the Board looking at each project. Now, the Board and its panels are looking for general characteristics and approach. Earlier lists were evaluated project by project. Some LE feel that this "grouping" approach makes it feel like the whole thing is homogenous and based on a LE ability to write a Strategy. This may scare some but it was the goal when we agreed to develop strategies to provide specificity and focus. And, base allocations and a formulaic predictable approach. The "black box" concern about review panel process is very real in that the Yakima never knew that it would be detrimental to the LE to submit poor projects. The outcome was that they got a bad score on fit to strategy. This put their strategy (fit to strategy) in the poor category. Had they know this in advance, they would have not submitted these projects. Submitting projects that are important to the community but that are not strategic addresses community issues but is a detriment to the strategy fit score. LEAG wants the Chair to communicate to the SRFB this issue. Ranking of fit to strategy for lists that contain "bad" projects is biased towards shorter lists, i.e., long lists likely contain "outliers" but are on the list because it is important to the community. Some LE shuffled their projects around on their list to achieve a high fit to strategy ranking. Some even removed projects from their list so their list would mirror their strategy and provide them an excellent score for project list fit to strategy. Jim provided a hand out that had a table showing the formulaic approach at grant allocation. The incremental approach will be used in 5th round based on the formula. The handout showed how far down each list will funded based on the first incremental approach. Likely each list will be funded to the level of the first increment by skipping POC's. This is consistent with Board's policy that 35% of the total amount available will be allocated on this formula. Some LE will get all projects funded without even reaching their allocated amount (like Snake). The remaining 65% will be allocated to programmatic requests, multi-le assessments, small projects, etc and the Board may consider funding one or more projects that are beyond the first increment while recognizing that doing so will detract from the other requests (programmatic, multi le, small projects, etc).
Follow up on SRFB Chair Requests to LEAG	***I. Follow-up on SRFB Requests to LEAG*** At the last SRFB meeting, Chairman Ruckelshaus requested help from LEAG on a range of topics. LEAG devoted significant time on the agenda to discuss these subjects, and I would like to report back on the results of those discussions. **1. Define measurable success.**

There are many aspects to consider when measuring success of the Lead Entity program. For example: Are we doing what needs to be done? Are we accomplishing what we say we are doing? Are we completing projects? Are the projects successful? Are we staying within costs? Results in terms of salmon population response will take time for some types of restoration projects, such as riparian plantings. Another success measure is building community support. This could be measured in terms of letters to editors, the number of talks with county officials, local participation, and polling of citizens. The leveraging of resources is another measure of success. To the extent that SRFB funds are leveraging other funding sources we are achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness for salmon recovery. Finally, measurable monitoring data, including the development and tracking of vsp criteria, may help show success, although the availability of monitoring information at the local LE level has decreased because of the statewide goals.

It was suggested that the PRISM system be used to collect success measures and to illustrate how we are doing - for example, the number of high priority projects funded or the change in percent of stream miles accessible to salmonids.

Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -
Our Habitat Plans describe strategies and actions to achieve a viable Chinook salmon population over the long-term, with specific recommendations on priorities and sequencing of implementation. Actions include habitat capital projects and acquisitions, regulations, incentives, programs, public involvement opportunities, and land use policies. The Plans will include adaptive management, and will provide specific measures to be monitored for success.

2. Give us the best possible projects.
In some cases, the "best projects" are very large scale and may not be readily fundable through the SRFB due to limited dollars. (Example given was the Yakima River flow issue.) LEAG members suggested a "project development approach" to deal with such larger scale projects.

Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -
The projects that we propose for funding by the SRFB are consistent with the science, strategies, and priorities of the Habitat Plans. The WRIAs 7, 8, and 9 projects address the de-listing criteria of the "Viable Salmonid Population" methodology which include: abundance; productivity; spatial structure; and diversity. The Plans include the sequencing of projects and the criteria for selecting them.

3. Ensure projects happen.
There is the potential for peer learning using case examples of projects that have not been completed, or were hung up for particular reasons. Some Lead Entities get involved with solving project problems, for example helping to get permit issues resolved. The best approach is to identify problems early and to obtain landowner support. Lead Entities would also benefit from some self-evaluation to learn how to improve their processes. It was recommended that project sponsors and SRFB staff keep Lead Entities in the loop when problems do arise with project implementation or completion. Many times they can play a valuable

role in resolving problems.

<u>Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -</u>
We work to highly leverage SRFB projects and maintain relationships with project sponsors from project identification through implementation. Project sponsors retain a strong role in implementation; therefore, it is critical that the SRFB continue to fund projects at high levels to maximize project implementation. In each of our plans, we have more projects identified than funds available to implement them.

4a. Inclusive citizen committees.
Inclusive means all are LEAG agreed to work with WDFW to provide a list of all the members of citizen committees and their affiliations to the SRFB. LEAG also agreed to provide a statement as to how local officials are involved in the LE process. (i.e. appoint members, sit on a committee directly, ratify lists, etc.) According to many Lead Entities, one area that needs improvement is the awareness of legislators. More outreach and education is needed through fieldtrips.

4b. Relationship with regional planning boards
Lead Entities are great at implementing projects and provide project list to Recovery Organization for consistency with Plan and to report accomplishments. The relationship varies across the State and will mature as time proceeds. Need to define role of watershed/LE strategies in relation to Shared Strategy. Local strategies are going to be advanced to regional strategy. Need to define role of regional board, which seems to be a process to empower local processes. Strategies roll up into recovery plan so project lists are consistent with regional plan. Large scale regional projects and other policies/decisions are larger than a watershed and need to be addressed at the regional level. Conversely, the Regional organizations need to clearly communicate to the LEs about their expected responsibilities.

<u>Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -</u>
Our citizen committees are inclusive of a wide range of interests, and involve local governments. In WRIAs 8 and 9, local governments cost-share habitat planning and will be asked to ratify the Habitat Plans, ensuring successful implementation of actions and priorities. In WRIA 7, the local governments of King County are cost sharing planning, while Snohomish County governments work together under a less formal arrangement to prepare the Habitat Plan (and its plan has a high level of consensus). Representation of local governments is strong in all cases.

We work closely with the Regional Planning group, Shared Strategy, on the development of the Habitat Plans that will be rolled up as Chapters into the Puget Sound Recovery Plan. WRIA 7 was the "case study" selected by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team to test watershed guidance that was developed for the watersheds (Lead Entities) of Puget Sound.

5. How to determine what strategies ought to be.
Lead Entities stressed that they are utilizing the best professional expertise and

fully engaging community leaders to develop their strategies. Once the VSP parameters are known, Lead Entities will have a much better idea of their strategies are on target. Trying to address watershed processes and site specific priorities is a challenge and a bit of a conundrum, especially for watersheds that have a multi-species approach. Since Lead Entity strategies are being rolled up into the recovery plan chapters, we will have a much better understanding of the adequacy of LE strategies once the plans are reviewed by the regional TRT's. There was also the comment that the strategy may go beyond what the SRFB can fund – recovery plan implementation will require significant new levels of funding.

Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -
Our strategies are highly geared toward addressing the needs identified by our scientific analysis, but the strategies also have built in community support because of our rigorous public outreach programs in developing the Habitat Plans. We are following guidance and procedures that have been established for us by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team and Shared Strategy.
We will have monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management that will test our hypotheses and assumptions upon which our Habitat Plans are based.

6. Do we have the right geographies for implementation?
There was an underlying concern about keeping salmon dollars for salmon projects. The relationship between watershed planning and salmon recovery efforts varies throughout the state. In some areas, these programs are well integrated and in other cases they are separate or solitary. Co-management issues are a great concern in a number of watersheds. Where boundary issues do not easily coincide (such as the Hood Canal and Kitsap areas), the boundary issues should be resolved locally.

Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -

In the case of WRIAs 7, 8 and 9, there are no 2514 planning processes, largely to respect tribal concerns with 2514 planning. Implementation of our 2496 Habitat Plan/Salmon Recovery efforts should not in any way be inhibited by any new implementation construct. Per the comment above about ensuring implementation of salmon projects, the key to implementation is adequate funding by the state and federal governments. Funding of salmon implementation (per discreet, scientifically-based plans and strategies) must remain a priority.

Feedback to SRFB on Communication	Susan Zemek, the new Communications Director at IAC came to ask questions of the LEAG participants to better understand the their needs. In the realm of communication, she wants to know what the SRFB and staff is doing well, and where they need to improve. Susan is interviewing many IAC partners and will be producing a communications audit report this January. Some of the questions and responses are captured below. **How often do lead entities hear from IAC?** Whenever there is an issue. Jim and Rollie along with Project Managers do an excellent job. This response also replies to process, in other words we are adequately apprised of process and then we hear from them when issues pop up.

5   01/21/2005

	With regards to SRFB, it feels like there is a lack of clear understanding before the process begins, i.e, criteria that you will award funds and grade strategies. For example, for the sixth round it is imperative to know the process, rules/policies before the round opens. **What kinds of information do we hear from IAC?** We want to hear more about upcoming issues so it would be nice to use IAC as our ears and eyes in Olympia. Materials for LEAG are very good from IAC and WDFW. **How can SRFB/IAC help?** Develop summaries of accomplishments so we can provide to legislators etc. Help organize tours with legislators. **How is the timing of information provided by the IAC/SRFB?** We would like de-briefing of 5th round process in advance of preparing for 6th round, i.e., why did we not perform well in review process. It often seems like decisions come before the Board without LEs having adequate time to research the topic and provide comments. **Are we up to speed on the decisions made by the IAC/SRFB?** Yes but it would be helpful to work through the issues used by the agencies to make such decision. **How many of you have used PRISM? Is it easy?** All have used it but many times firewalls prevent or dramatically slow down it's usability. The actual database is very helpful and informative, but getting access can be challenging. **Have you attended project workshops? Are they helpful?** YES-YES-YES **Are there any products or services related to communications that would be helpful?** Statistics, accomplishments, brochures type stuff would be helpful. DVD's showing photos/movie clips of projects. **What else can IAC/SRFB do to communicate with lead entities?** Organize and provide lessons learned/good ideas to all the lead entities. Workshop to discuss lessons learned.
Recovery Plan Implementation	At the last SRFB meeting, the Council of Regions (COR) presented a proposal for recovery plan implementation. The proposal had not been released in time for prior LEAG review. Therefore this topic was crafted to begin the development of a LEAG vision for local watershed implementation LEAG members had a number of questions about the document presented by the Council of Regions. Some expressed concerns about the lack of prior LEAG consultation. Steve Martin and Joel Freudenthal, Snake River and Yakima River Recovery Board representatives, provided useful insights at the LEAG meeting. [GSRO asked each region to submit what implementation will look like, what needs to be done and how much will it cost. Each Region's response was very similar. So GSRO asked us to put a summary together for Kramer to share with the SRFB. The thinking was that if the State wants to fully implement its recovery strategy, the regional model is required.] LEAG discussed each section of the COR proposal. One section that drew a response was the "Overall Recommendations – Section D." Some LEAG members stated that the combining of implementation plans is problematic in their region and they questioned the assertion that it would

result in increased efficiency. There was a concern about loss of salmon dollars for salmon projects. Section F. was deemed a problem for one Lead Entity in the Columbia Basin. LEAG does agree with I. B of the COR paper, and recommends that solutions be determined at the WRIA/LE geographic area.

LEAG recommends that each of the items in the Oct 28 COR paper be fully described and call the items assumptions not recommendations. In order for the LEAG to make a more informed decision it would need to see the analysis, deliverables, budget etc that go into the COR recommendations.

The GSRO proposal assumes that there are a bundle of approved plans in a watershed. As we move into implementation we have a pile of plans ready to implement. Is there a way for one group to implement those plans? The concept is just for implementation of completed, adopted plans not more planning.

Legislation for implementing water and salmon plans is in quasi bill form and if the LEAG wants to say anything about the future the LEAG needs to get together and develop a response. No one knows the status of this draft legislation yet.

It was suggested that LEAG hold its next meeting in Vancouver, WA on December 16. The Council of Regions is planning to meet on the same date to discuss recovery plan implementation. LEAG members wanted to explore the idea of meeting together on this issue.

<u>Additional comments provided by WRIA's 7, 8 and 9 -</u>
Key program concepts:
- Conduct a full-fledged 6th Funding Cycle with Lead Entities and Citizens Committees at the core; keep it LOCAL
- Secure state and federal funds for continued salmon plan implementation at the Lead Entity/watershed level
- Obtain legislative authority for local governments to collect funds to support plan implementation
- Streamline SRFB (or its successor) funding processes to match priorities of local watershed habitat plans
- Develop a "block grant" program to disperse predictable annual funding to Lead Entities

Key Lead Entity Functions:
- Adopt Habitat Plans (containing strategic actions)
- Implement Habitat Plans (or habitat work schedules per 2496) with adequate funding from local, state, and federal agencies
- Coordinate across local governments and other entities on implementation
- Staff citizens committees and local government forums
- Support project sponsors
- Develop funding relationships with local, state, and federal agencies
- Secure federal, state, and local funds to implement plans
- Coordinate and integrate programs within watersheds
- Prioritize programs and projects to match available funds and work programs
- Manage watershed structure and process

	▪ Manage community involvement and outreach ▪ Conduct planning and strategic assessments, including adaptive management programs ▪ Prepare reports and track results ▪ Raise funds and communicate with funding organizations There was no Buddy Report response to Nichols paper.
6th Round Grant Workshop	LEAG members agreed to the idea of having a workshop in January to discuss possible changes/improvements for the 6th funding round. LEAG members would like to participate in a steering committee with IAC and WDFW staff for the planning of the workshop. SRFB members and review panel members would be encouraged to attend. LEAG wants the SRFB to remain largely unchanged. If a 6th funding round workshop is to be held then it needs to be held in Jan if any changes will be made to the 6th Round. This workshop would be simply to look at the 5th round and provide recommendations to the SRFB. Review panel and SRFB members would be encouraged to attend. The recommendation was that the LEAG set up a steering committee to work with Staff to frame the workshop.
Status and Trends Monitoring	A Status and Trends monitoring discussion was initiated by Richard Brocksmith. He feels that this proposal to the SRFB sponsored by WDFW and Ecology is duplicative of monitoring efforts undertaken at the local level and the data collected only be useful for statewide analysis. Other LEs agreed that the state's monitoring efforts have not been communicated clearly to LE, and therefore mis-coordination may arise. The status and trends proposal will be evaluated and prioritized at the Nov 29 Governor's Monitoring Forum, and based on their recommendations will come before the SRFB for possible funding. LEAG requested that IAC post the Monitoring Forums Status and Trends Monitoring proposal on the Web. It was also suggested that a Lead Entity representative sit on the Monitoring Forum to increase local communication.
NEXT MEETING	**Tentatively December 16 in Vancouver**